

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/533,082	04/28/2005	Stefan Bitterlich	270624US0PCT 2316		
22850 ODI ONI SDIN	7590 11/05/200	EXAM	EXAMINER		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			CHEUNG, V	CHEUNĢ, WILLIAM K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1796			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/05/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/533,082	BITTERLICH ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
William K. Cheung	1796		

	LXammo	Aironic					
	William K. Cheung	1796					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 19 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance.	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
time periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: if box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
·	sliance with 27 OFD 44 27 must be	filed within two meants	646				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause				
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. Sac attached Nation of Non-Co	maliant Amandmant	(DTOL 224)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. Solution for the first state of the proposed amendment (s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7,9 and 10</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a				
10. 🗌 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>							
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:							
	•	0					
WILLIAM K. CHEUNG WILLIAM K. CHEUNG WILLIAM K. CHEUNG							
10/30/67 WILLIAM K. CHECKINER PRIMARY EXAMINER							
- 11							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As requested by applicants, claim 8 has been cancelled. Claims 1-7, 9, 10 are pending. Regarding the 112 rejection set forth, applicants argue that the recitation "oligomerizing" of claim 1 (b) clearly support the "octenes and dodecenes" of claim 7. However, the examiner disagrees. Applicants must recognize that the recitation of "oligomerizing" of claim 1 teaches that the I-C4 is to be polymerized to form oligomers. There is not an indication in claim 1 to support that oligomers (low molecular weight polybutenes) are octenes or docecenes. Applicants must recognize that octenes and doecenes are monomers, not oligomers. Regarding applicants' argument that Pierottie et al. do not disclose the use of NAFION® and believes that oligomerization does not take place in Pierottie et al., applicants fail to recognize that Pierottie et al. and Harmer et al. disclose aluminosilicate. Regarding the rest of applicants' argument that Pierottie et al. do not teaching oligomerization, the examiner believes that since Pierottie et al. and Harmer et al. both disclose aluminosilicate. Therefore, the rationale for the rejection set forth June 26, 2007 is considered adequate, especially in view of the 112 rejection set forth. The examiner has a reasonable basis to maintain the rejection set forth since the claims as written are not in allowable conditions.

WILLIAM K. CHEUNG

2